

NEW RESULTS IN HEAT-KERNEL ASYMPTOTICS ON MANIFOLDS WITH BOUNDARY

Giampiero Esposito

*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli, Mostra d'Oltremare Padiglione
20, 80125 Napoli, Italy*

*Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Complesso Universitario
di Monte S. Angelo, Via Cintia, Edificio G, 80126 Napoli, Italy*

Abstract. A review is presented of some recent progress in spectral geometry on manifolds with boundary: local boundary-value problems where the boundary operator includes the effect of tangential derivatives; application of conformal variations and other functorial methods to the evaluation of heat-kernel coefficients; conditions for strong ellipticity of the boundary-value problem; fourth-order operators on manifolds with boundary; non-local boundary conditions in Euclidean quantum gravity. Many deep developments in physics and mathematics are therefore in sight.

*Fourth Workshop on Quantum Field Theory under the Influence of External Conditions,
Leipzig, September 1998 (DSF preprint 98/23).*

1. Introduction

The investigation of the heat equation for differential (or pseudo-differential) operators on manifolds with boundary remains of high relevance in physics and mathematics. Mathematicians are more interested in the general properties of spectral geometry and spectral asymptotics, with the aim of interpreting the various heat-kernel coefficients with the help of invariance theory [1–3] in a neat, elegant and deep way, and of finding resolvent and heat kernel also when the boundary-value problem is pseudo-differential [4]. Heat-equation proofs of the index theorem are also available, by now [3,5]. Theoretical physicists, on the other hand, remain more interested in the applications, e.g. boundary conditions for Euclidean quantum gravity [6–13], one-loop semiclassical approximation [8,12], and the quantization programme for gauge theories on manifolds with boundary [14–17].

In the first part of our presentation, we shall consider an m -dimensional Riemannian manifold, say (M, g) , a vector bundle V over M , with a connection ∇ , and operators of Laplace type:

$$P \equiv -g^{ab}\nabla_a\nabla_b - E, \quad (1.1)$$

with E an endomorphism of V . The corresponding heat kernel is, by definition, a solution, for $t > 0$, of the equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + P\right) U(x, x'; t) = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

which obeys the initial condition

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_M U(x, x'; t) \rho(x') \sqrt{\det g} \, dx = \rho(x), \quad (1.3)$$

and suitable (local or non-local) boundary conditions

$$\left[\mathcal{B}U(x, x'; t) \right]_{\partial M} = 0 \quad . \quad (1.4)$$

In the case of local boundary conditions, we shall assume them to be of the form [17]

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ \Lambda & \mathbb{I} - \Pi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} [\varphi]_{\partial M} \\ [\nabla_N \varphi]_{\partial M} \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (1.5)$$

where Π is a self-adjoint projection operator, Λ is a tangential differential operator on the boundary of M :

$$\Lambda \equiv (\mathbb{I} - \Pi) \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\Gamma^i \widehat{\nabla}_i + \widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^i \right) + S \right] (\mathbb{I} - \Pi), \quad (1.6)$$

and φ are the fields, i.e. the smooth sections of the bundle V . With the notation of Eq. (1.6), $\widehat{\nabla}$ is the induced connection on ∂M , Γ^i are endomorphism-valued vector fields on the boundary, and S is an endomorphism of the vector bundle over ∂M which is a copy of $[V]_{\partial M}$, with sections given by $[\varphi]_{\partial M}$. Γ^i and S are anti-self-adjoint and self-adjoint, respectively, and are annihilated by Π on the left and on the right, i.e. $\Pi \Gamma^i = \Gamma^i \Pi = \Pi S = S \Pi = 0$. As is shown in [3,11,12,16,17], one arrives at such boundary conditions whenever one tries to obtain gauge- and BRST-invariant boundary conditions in quantum field theory.

We will be interested in the asymptotic expansion as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ of the L^2 -trace [20]

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left(f e^{-tP} \right) \equiv \int_M f(x) \mathrm{Tr}_V U(x, x; t) \sqrt{\det g} \, dx, \quad (1.7)$$

where $f \in C^\infty(M)$. This is also called the *integrated heat kernel*. Equation (1.7) means that one first takes the fibre trace of the heat-kernel diagonal. Composition with the smearing function f , and integration over M , yields the functional trace (1.7). The results for the original boundary-value problem are eventually recovered by setting $f = 1$, but it is crucial to keep the smearing function arbitrary throughout the whole set of calculations. In other words, we consider the *global*, integrated asymptotics, for which

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2} \left(f e^{-tP} \right) \sim (4\pi t)^{-\frac{m}{2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} t^{\frac{n}{2}} A_{\frac{n}{2}}(f, P, \mathcal{B}). \quad (1.8)$$

The coefficients $A_{\frac{n}{2}}$ can be always expressed in the form

$$A_{\frac{n}{2}}(f, P, \mathcal{B}) = C_{\frac{n}{2}}(f, P) + B_{\frac{n}{2}}(f, P, \mathcal{B}). \quad (1.9)$$

The coefficients $C_{\frac{n}{2}}$ and $B_{\frac{n}{2}}$ are the interior part and the boundary part, respectively. The interior part vanishes for all odd values of n , whereas the boundary part only vanishes if

$n = 0$. The interior part is obtained by integrating over M a linear combination of *local invariants* of the appropriate dimension, built universally and polynomially from the metric, the Riemann curvature R^a_{bcd} of M , the bundle curvature, say Ω_{ab} , the endomorphism E in the operator (1.1), and their covariant derivatives. By virtue of the Weyl theorem on the invariants of the orthogonal group [1,2], which is $O(m)$ for M , these polynomials can be found by using only tensor products and contraction of tensor arguments. Moreover, the boundary part is obtained upon integration over ∂M of another linear combination of local invariants. In that case, however, the structure group is $O(m-1)$, and the coefficients of linear combination are *universal functions*, independent of m , unaffected by conformal rescalings of the metric g , and invariant in form (i.e. they are functions of position on the boundary, whose form is independent of the boundary being curved or totally geodesic).

Thus, the general form of the $A_{\frac{n}{2}}$ coefficient is a well posed problem in invariance theory, where one has to take all possible local invariants built from $f, R^a_{bcd}, \Omega_{ab}, K_{ij}, E, S, \Gamma^i$ and their covariant derivatives (hereafter, K_{ij} is the extrinsic-curvature tensor of the boundary), integrating eventually their linear combinations over M and ∂M , respectively. For example, in the boundary part $B_{\frac{n}{2}}(f, P, \mathcal{B})$, the local invariants integrated over ∂M are of dimension $n-1$ in tensors of the same dimension of the second fundamental form of the boundary, for all $n \geq 1$. The universal functions associated to all such invariants can be found by using functorial methods, e.g. conformal variations, lemmas on product manifolds [1,2], jointly with the consideration of some particular manifolds (see below).

Section 2 shows how to apply the conformal-variation method to heat-kernel asymptotics for the generalized boundary-value problem resulting from (1.1), (1.5) and (1.6). Section 3 describes the recent results on the issue of strong ellipticity for this class of local boundary-value problems. Fourth-order operators on manifolds with boundary are studied in section 4, and some recent ideas on integro-differential boundary conditions in Euclidean quantum gravity are discussed in section 5. Section 6 is devoted to some open problems, and a number of new heat-kernel coefficients are evaluated in the appendix.

2. Conformal variations and heat-kernel coefficients

The conformal-variation method [18–21] is based on the behaviour of the heat kernel under conformal rescalings. The idea is to perform a conformal deformation of the differential operator P and of the boundary operator $\mathcal{B}$, with a deformation parameter, say ε (see below). This is used to determine a set of recurrence relations (see (2.1)–(2.3)) which reduce the evaluation of heat-kernel asymptotics to the solution of a system of algebraic equations for a finite set of coefficients. More precisely, the “conformal variations” of the metric and of the inward-pointing normal are $g_{ab}(\varepsilon) = e^{2\varepsilon f} g_{ab}(0)$, $N^a(\varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon f} N^a(0)$. The conformal variation of the potential terms $E(\varepsilon)$, $S(\varepsilon)$ and $\Gamma^i(\varepsilon)$ is chosen in such a way that the operator P and the boundary operator $\mathcal{B}$ transform according to $P(\varepsilon) = e^{-2\varepsilon f} P(0)$, $\mathcal{B}(\varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon f} \mathcal{B}(0)$. This implies, in particular, that $\Gamma^i(\varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon f} \Gamma^i(0)$. Three basic conformal-variation formulae hold [1-3]:

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} A_{\frac{n}{2}} \left(1, e^{-2\varepsilon f} P(0), e^{-\varepsilon f} \mathcal{B}(0) \right) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = (m - n) A_{\frac{n}{2}} \left(f, P(0), \mathcal{B}(0) \right), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} A_{\frac{n}{2}} \left(1, P(0) - \varepsilon H, e^{-\varepsilon f} \mathcal{B}(0) \right) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = A_{\frac{n}{2}-1} \left(H, P(0), \mathcal{B}(0) \right), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\left[\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} A_{\frac{n}{2}} \left(e^{-2\varepsilon f} H, e^{-2\varepsilon f} P(0), e^{-\varepsilon f} \mathcal{B}(0) \right) \right]_{\varepsilon=0} = 0, \quad (2.3)$$

where H is another function $\in C^\infty(M)$, different from f . Our analysis, relying on Refs. [20,21], is restricted to the case when the following conditions hold:

$$[\Gamma^i, \Gamma^j] = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

$$[\Gamma^2, S] = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^j = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

In other words, the matrices Γ^i commute with each other, the matrix $\Gamma^2 \equiv \Gamma_i \Gamma^i$ commutes with S , and the matrices Γ^i are taken to be covariantly constant with respect to the induced

connection, $\widehat{\nabla}$, on the boundary. These assumptions are indeed quite restrictive, but, for the time being, not even the A_1 coefficient is known if (2.4)–(2.6) fail to hold, because formidable technical difficulties are found to arise [17,20,21]. Thus, Eqs. (2.4)–(2.6) do not express a compulsory step, but represent the current limits of what one is able to do.

Although the Eqs. (2.4)–(2.6) impose severe restrictions, a non-trivial invariance theory is found to contribute many new local invariants to the heat-kernel asymptotics. Explicitly, one finds the following structure of the first few interior terms [18,20,21]:

$$B_{\frac{1}{2}}(f, P, \mathcal{B}) = \sqrt{4\pi} \int_{\partial M} \text{Tr}(\gamma f), \quad (2.7)$$

$$B_1(f, P, \mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{6} \int_{\partial M} \text{Tr} \left[f(b_0 K + b_2 S) + b_1 f_{;N} + f \left(\sigma_1 K_{ij} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j \right) \right], \quad (2.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\frac{3}{2}}(f, P, \mathcal{B}) = & \frac{\sqrt{4\pi}}{384} \int_{\partial M} \text{Tr} \left\{ f \left[\left(c_0 E + c_1 R + c_2 R^{iN}_{iN} + c_3 K^2 \right. \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \left. + c_4 K_{ij} K^{ij} + c_7 S K + c_8 S^2 \right) + f_{;N} (c_5 K + c_9 S) + c_6 f_{;NN} \right] \right. \\ & + \frac{\sqrt{4\pi}}{384} \int_{\partial M} \text{Tr} \left\{ f \left[\sigma_2 (K_{ij} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j)^2 + \sigma_3 K_{ij} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j K + \sigma_4 K_{il} K^l_j \Gamma^i \Gamma^j \right. \right. \\ & + \lambda_1 K_{ij} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j S + \mu_1 R_i^N{}_{jN} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j + \mu_2 R^l_{ilj} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j \\ & \left. \left. \left. + \tilde{b}_1 \Omega_{iN} \Gamma^i \right] + \beta_1 f_{;N} K_{ij} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

For any subsequent interior term, the number of new local invariants resulting from the occurrence of Γ^i in the boundary operator is higher and higher (but finite). For example, in the integrand for the coefficient $B_2(f, P, \mathcal{B})$, 33 new local invariants (involving Γ^i) multiply f , 7 local invariants multiply $f_{;N}$, and 1 local invariant, $K_{ij} \Gamma^i \Gamma^j$, multiplies $f_{;NN}$ [20,21]. All universal functions occurring in (2.7)–(2.9) have been evaluated, thanks to the work in Refs. [15,17,18,20,21]. They are all expressed in terms of the functions

$$\sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2}, \quad \sqrt{-\Gamma^2}, \quad \text{Arctanh}(\sqrt{-\Gamma^2}).$$

For example, one finds, with the help of Eq. (2.1), and considering a particular case (i.e. a flat background with a totally geodesic boundary) which provides further information [18,20]:

$$\sigma_1 = \frac{6}{\Gamma^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{-\Gamma^2}} \text{Arctanh}(\sqrt{-\Gamma^2}) - \frac{1}{(1 + \Gamma^2)} \right). \quad (2.10)$$

A remarkable piece of work, in Ref. [21], has evaluated all universal functions in (2.9), by using the formulae (2.1)–(2.3), jointly with a lemma on product manifolds [1,2], and the consideration of particular manifolds, i.e. the bounded generalized cone, and the manifold with $B^2 \times T^{m-2}$ topology (T^{m-2} being the equilateral $(m - 2)$ -dimensional torus). The consideration of particular cases is always useful and, indeed, strictly necessary (so far), by virtue of the universal nature of the functions of Γ^2 one is looking for (see comments after (1.9)).

3. Strong ellipticity

If one studies compact Riemannian manifolds without boundary, it is enough to make sure that the leading symbol of the differential operator under consideration is elliptic. In the presence of boundaries, however, one has also to check that the strong ellipticity condition holds. At a technical level, this requires that a unique solution should exist of the eigenvalue equation for the leading symbol $\sigma_L(P)$, subject to a decay condition at infinity and to suitable boundary conditions. To obtain a precise formulation, one has to consider local coordinates on the boundary ∂M , say $\hat{x}^k$ ($k = 1, \dots, m - 1$), the normal geodesic distance to ∂M , say r , cotangent vectors on the boundary, say $\zeta_j \in T^*(\partial M)$ ($j = 1, \dots, m - 1$), a real parameter, say ω , the *graded leading symbol* of the boundary operator in Eq. (1.5) (cf. the first matrix therein):

$$\sigma_g(B_P) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ i\Gamma^j \zeta_j & \mathbb{1} - \Pi \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.1)$$

and an arbitrary pair of boundary data, i.e.

$$\psi' \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \psi'_0 \\ \psi'_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.2)$$

where such a ψ' is, strictly, a smooth section of an “auxiliary” vector bundle over ∂M , endowed with a decomposition into sub-bundles, with half the dimension of the bundle of boundary data.

By definition, strong ellipticity holds with respect to the cone $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{R}_+$ if a unique solution exists, say φ , of the equation [2,17,22]

$$\left[\sigma_L(P; \hat{x}^k, r=0, \zeta_j, -i\partial_r) - \lambda \mathbb{I} \right] \varphi(r) = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

subject to the asymptotic condition

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(r) = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

and to the boundary condition (hereafter, $\hat{x} \equiv \{\hat{x}^k\}, \zeta \equiv \{\zeta_j\}$)

$$\sigma_g(B_P)(\hat{x}, \zeta) \begin{pmatrix} [\varphi]_{\partial M} \\ [\nabla_N \varphi]_{\partial M} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi'_0 \\ \psi'_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.5)$$

$\forall \zeta \in T^*(\partial M), \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{C} - \mathcal{R}_+, \forall (\zeta, \lambda) \neq (0, 0)$ and $\forall \psi'$. What is crucial, for the physicists who are interested in the applications to quantum field theory (as well as for mathematicians who might be more interested in heat-kernel theory), is that the lack of strong ellipticity leads to a fibre trace of the heat-kernel diagonal which acquires a non-integrable part near the boundary. It is hence impossible to make sense of the integrated heat kernel (cf. (1.7))

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L^2}(e^{-tP}) \equiv \int_M \mathrm{Tr}_V U(x, x; t) \sqrt{\det g} \, dx, \quad (3.6)$$

with the corresponding global asymptotics as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ (unless one studies a smeared form along the lines of (1.7)).

This is why, in Ref. [17], a systematic investigation of strong ellipticity for local boundary-value problems involving operators of Laplace and Dirac type has been carried out. For the former class of differential operators, which are our main source of concern so far, the work in Refs. [17,22] may be summarized as follows.

(i) Let P be an operator of Laplace type, with boundary operator as in Eq. (1.5):

$$B_P \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ \Lambda & \mathbb{I} - \Pi \end{pmatrix}.$$

The boundary-value problem (P, B_P) is strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{R}_+$ if and only if, for all $\zeta \neq 0$, the matrix $|\zeta| \mathbb{I} - i\Gamma^j \zeta_j$ is positive-definite, where $|\zeta| \equiv +\sqrt{\zeta_j \zeta^j}$.

(ii) The boundary-value problem for Euclidean Yang–Mills theory at one-loop level, with the gauge-invariant boundary conditions (N being the normal to the boundary)

$$\left[(\delta_a^b - N_a N^b) \varphi_b \right]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (3.7)$$

$$\left[\nabla^a \varphi_a \right]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (3.8)$$

is strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{R}_+$.

(iii) In Euclidean quantum gravity at one-loop level, the vector bundle V is the bundle of symmetric rank-two tensor fields φ_{ab} over M , with fibre metric

$$E^{ab\ cd} \equiv g^{a(c} g^{d)b} + \alpha g^{ab} g^{cd}, \quad (3.9)$$

where α is a real parameter different from $-\frac{1}{m}$ (for $\alpha = -\frac{1}{m}$, no inverse of E can be defined). On considering the tensor $q_{ab} \equiv g_{ab} - N_a N_b$, the projection operator which is self-adjoint with respect to the bundle metric (3.9) reads

$$\Pi_{ab}{}^{cd} \equiv q_{(a}^c q_{b)}^d - \frac{\alpha}{(\alpha + 1)} N_a N_b q^{cd}. \quad (3.10)$$

The boundary conditions invariant under infinitesimal diffeomorphisms on metric perturbations can be therefore expressed in the form [17]

$$\left[\Pi_{ab}{}^{cd} \varphi_{cd} \right]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (3.11)$$

$$\left[E^{ab\ cd}(\alpha) \nabla_b \varphi_{cd} \right]_{\partial M} = 0. \quad (3.12)$$

If $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$, the operator on metric perturbations is then of Laplace type, say P again. Regrettably, one then finds that the boundary-value problem (P, B_P) , with B_P the boundary operator of the type (1.5) and (1.6) which gives rise to (3.11) and (3.12) with $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$, is not strongly elliptic with respect to $\mathcal{C} - \mathcal{R}_+$. The work in Ref. [17] has also evaluated the non-integrable contribution to the fibre trace of the heat-kernel diagonal, which can be expected on general ground if strong ellipticity is violated, as we said after Eq. (3.5).

In other words, only for Euclidean quantum gravity based on the Einstein action the strong ellipticity condition is violated, on using gauge-invariant boundary conditions of the form (3.11) and (3.12). On the other hand, as shown in Ref. [16], such boundary conditions can be re-derived, independently, by requiring invariance under BRST transformations. It therefore seems that a BRST-invariant quantization of the gravitational field presents serious inconsistencies on manifolds with boundary, unless one accepts the view according to which the BRST invariance of the amplitudes does not force the boundary conditions to be, themselves, BRST invariant [14].

4. Fourth-order operators on manifolds with boundary

The current attempts to develop quantum field theories of fundamental interactions have led to the consideration of fourth-order or even higher-order differential operators on closed Riemannian manifolds [23–27], or on manifolds with boundary [3,28,29]. The analysis of the transformation properties under conformal rescalings of the background metric, say g , leads, in particular, to the consideration of conformally covariant operators, say Q , which transform according to the law

$$Q_\omega = e^{-(m+4)\omega/2} Q(\omega = 0) e^{(m-4)\omega/2}, \quad (4.1)$$

if g rescales as $g_\omega = e^{2\omega} g$, m being the dimension of the Riemannian manifold which is studied. One of the physical motivations for this analysis lies in the possibility to use the Green functions of such operators to build the effective action in curved space-times [25].

Another enlightening example is provided by the ghost sector of Euclidean Maxwell theory in vacuum in four dimensions. The corresponding field equations are well known to be invariant under conformal rescalings of g . On the other hand, the supplementary

(or gauge) conditions usually considered in the literature are not invariant under conformal rescalings of g . Even just in flat Euclidean four-space, conformal invariance of the supplementary condition is only achieved on making the Eastwood–Singer choice [30]:

$$\nabla_b \nabla^b \nabla^c A_c = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

where A_c is the electromagnetic potential (a connection one-form in geometric language). The preservation of Eq. (4.2) under gauge transformations of A_c :

$$^f A_c \equiv A_c + \nabla_c f, \quad (4.3)$$

is achieved provided that f obeys the fourth-order equation

$$\square^2 f = 0, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\square^2$ is the box operator composed with itself:

$$\square^2 \equiv \nabla_a \nabla^a \nabla_b \nabla^b.$$

In the corresponding quantum theory via path integrals, one thus deals with two independent ghost fields (frequently referred to as the ghost and the anti-ghost), both ruled by $\square^2$, which is a fourth-order elliptic operator, and subject to the following boundary conditions:

$$[\varepsilon]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (4.5)$$

$$\left[\nabla_N \varepsilon \right]_{\partial M} = 0. \quad (4.6)$$

Remarkably, since one now deals with a fourth-order elliptic operator, it is insufficient to impose just Dirichlet or Neumann (or Robin) boundary conditions. One needs instead both (4.5) and (4.6), which are obtained from the following requirements:

- (i) Gauge invariance of the boundary conditions on A_b [3,28].
- (ii) Conformal invariance of the whole set of boundary conditions.
- (iii) Self-adjointness of the $\square^2$ operator (see below).

Although it remains extremely difficult to build a consistent quantization scheme via path-integral formalism for the full Maxwell field in the Eastwood–Singer gauge (the gauge-field operator on A_b perturbations being, then, of sixth order [3,28]), the investigation of the ghost sector remains of considerable interest in this case. There is in fact, on the one hand, the need to understand how to quantize a gauge theory in a way which preserves conformal invariance at all stages (as we just said), and on the other hand the attempt to extend the recent work on conformally covariant operators [23–27] to the more realistic case of manifolds with boundary.

For simplicity, we consider the squared Laplace operator acting on scalar fields on a flat Euclidean background, in the case when curvature effects result from the boundary only. Moreover, motivated by quantum cosmology and Euclidean quantum gravity, the boundary is assumed to be a three-sphere of radius a , say, or a pair of concentric three-spheres [8,12]. The former case, in particular, may be viewed as the limiting case when the wave function of the universe is studied at small three-geometries (i.e. as $a \rightarrow 0$), as shown in Ref. [31].

In our problem it is hence possible to expand the scalar field on a family of three-spheres centred on the origin, according to the familiar relation [32]

$$\varepsilon(x, \tau) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n(\tau) Q^{(n)}(x), \quad (4.7)$$

where $\tau \in [0, a]$, $Q^{(n)}$ are the scalar harmonics on a unit three-sphere, S^3 , and x are local coordinates on S^3 . Thus, one is eventually led to study a one-dimensional differential operator of fourth order, and this makes it clear why all the essential information is obtained by the analysis of the operator $B \equiv \frac{d^4}{dx^4}$ on a closed interval of the real line, say $[0, 1]$. The operator B is required to act on functions which are at least of class C^4 (see (4.18)), and the following definition of scalar product (anti-linear in the first argument) is considered:

$$(u, v) \equiv \int_0^1 u^*(x) v(x) dx. \quad (4.8)$$

We now want to study under which conditions the operator B is self-adjoint, which means that it should be symmetric, and its domain should coincide with the domain of the adjoint, say $B^\dagger$. For this purpose, we first study the relation between the scalar products (Bu, v) and (u, Bv) . We have then to integrate repeatedly by parts, using the Leibniz rule to express

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{d^3 u^*}{dx^3} v \right), \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{d^2 u^*}{dx^2} \frac{dv}{dx} \right), \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{du^*}{dx} \frac{d^2 v}{dx^2} \right), \frac{d}{dx} \left(u^* \frac{d^3 v}{dx^3} \right).$$

This leads to

$$(Bu, v) = \left[\frac{d^3 u^*}{dx^3} v \right]_0^1 - \left[\frac{d^2 u^*}{dx^2} \frac{dv}{dx} \right]_0^1 + \left[\frac{du^*}{dx} \frac{d^2 v}{dx^2} \right]_0^1 - \left[u^* \frac{d^3 v}{dx^3} \right]_0^1 + (u, Bv). \quad (4.9)$$

Bearing in mind that the adjoint, $B^\dagger$, of $\frac{d^4}{dx^4}$ is again the operator $\frac{d^4}{dx^4}$, it is thus clear that the condition $(Bu, v) = (u, B^\dagger v)$ is fulfilled provided that *both* $u \in D(B)$ and $v \in D(B^\dagger)$ obey one of the following four sets of boundary conditions:

(i) First option:

$$u(0) = u(1) = 0 \quad u'(0) = u'(1) = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

$$v(0) = v(1) = 0 \quad v'(0) = v'(1) = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

(ii) Second option:

$$u(0) = u(1) = 0 \quad u''(0) = u''(1) = 0, \quad (4.12)$$

$$v(0) = v(1) = 0 \quad v''(0) = v''(1) = 0. \quad (4.13)$$

(iii) Third option:

$$u'(0) = u'(1) = 0 \quad u'''(0) = u'''(1) = 0, \quad (4.14)$$

$$v'(0) = v'(1) = 0 \quad v'''(0) = v'''(1) = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

(iv) Fourth option:

$$u''(0) = u''(1) = 0 \quad u'''(0) = u'''(1) = 0, \quad (4.16)$$

$$v''(0) = v''(1) = 0 \quad v'''(0) = v'''(1) = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

In other words, if the conditions (4.10) and (4.11), or (4.12) and (4.13), or (4.14) and (4.15), or (4.16) and (4.17) are satisfied, the domains of B and of its adjoint turn out to coincide [29]:

$$D(B) = D(B^\dagger) \equiv \{u : u \in AC^4[0, 1], \text{ (4.10) or (4.12) or (4.14) or (4.16) holds} \}. \quad (4.18)$$

With our notation, $AC^4[0, 1]$ is the set of functions in $L^2[0, 1]$ whose weak derivatives up to third order are absolutely continuous in $[0, 1]$, which ensures that the weak derivatives, up to fourth order, are Lebesgue summable in $[0, 1]$, and that all u in the domain are of class C^4 on $[0, 1]$. Of course, symmetry of B is also obtained with the boundary conditions just described.

In other words, four sets of boundary conditions, (i) or (ii) or (iii) or (iv), can be chosen to ensure self-adjointness of the operator $\frac{d^4}{dx^4}$. Hereafter, we first consider the option (i), since it agrees with boundary conditions motivated by the request of gauge invariance and conformal invariance, if the scalar field is viewed as one of the two ghost fields of Euclidean Maxwell theory in the Eastwood-Singer gauge. We also stress again that nothing is lost on studying just the “prototype” operator $\frac{d^4}{dx^4}$. The one-dimensional fourth-order operator may take a more complicated form in some set of local coordinates (see (4.19)), but is always reducible to the operator $\frac{d^4}{dx^4}$ on the real line (more precisely, a closed interval of $\Re$ in our problems).

The definition and evaluation of functional determinants remains a topic of crucial importance in quantum field theory. Here the task is even more interesting, because we are studying a fourth-order elliptic operator on a manifold with boundary. As shown in Refs. [3, 28], the resulting eigenvalue equation for the modes occurring in the expansion (4.7) turns out to be, on the Euclidean four-ball,

$$\left[\frac{d^4}{d\tau^4} + \frac{6}{\tau} \frac{d^3}{d\tau^3} - \frac{(2n^2 - 5)}{\tau^2} \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} - \frac{(2n^2 + 1)}{\tau^3} \frac{d}{d\tau} + \frac{(n^2 - 1)^2}{\tau^4} \right] \varepsilon_n = \lambda_n \varepsilon_n. \quad (4.19)$$

Thus, on setting $M \equiv \lambda_n^{1/4}$, the solution of Eq. (4.19) is expressed by a linear combination of Bessel functions and modified Bessel functions [29], i.e.

$$\varepsilon_n(\tau) = A_{1,n} \frac{I_n(M\tau)}{\tau} + A_{2,n} \frac{K_n(M\tau)}{\tau} + A_{3,n} \frac{J_n(M\tau)}{\tau} + A_{4,n} \frac{N_n(M\tau)}{\tau}. \quad (4.20)$$

Since the Euclidean four-ball consists of a portion of flat Euclidean four-space bounded by a three-sphere, the coefficients $A_{2,n}$ and $A_{4,n}$ have to vanish $\forall n \geq 1$, to ensure regularity of ε_n at the origin. One is thus left with scalar modes of the form

$$\varepsilon_n(\tau) = A_{1,n} \frac{I_n(M\tau)}{\tau} + A_{3,n} \frac{J_n(M\tau)}{\tau}. \quad (4.21)$$

These massless modes are subject to the boundary conditions (see (4.5), (4.6) and (4.10), (4.11))

$$[\varepsilon_n]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (4.22)$$

$$[d\varepsilon_n/d\tau]_{\partial M} = 0. \quad (4.23)$$

The Eqs. (4.21)–(4.23) lead to the eigenvalue condition (denoting by a the radius of the three-sphere)

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} I_n(Ma) & J_n(Ma) \\ -I_n(Ma) + MaI'_n(Ma) & -J_n(Ma) + MaJ'_n(Ma) \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (4.24)$$

which guarantees that non-trivial solutions exist for the coefficients $A_{1,n}$ and $A_{3,n}$ in (4.21). As proved in Ref. [29], Eq. (4.24) leads to the following $\zeta(0)$ value:

$$\zeta(0) = -\frac{1}{120}. \quad (4.25)$$

This is of some interest, because the one-loop analysis remains crucial in the course of studying quantum theory as a theory of small disturbances [33] of the underlying classical theory.

In the two-boundary problem one studies instead a portion of flat Euclidean four-space bounded by two concentric three-spheres. This case is very interesting because it is more

directly related to the familiar framework in quantum field theory, where one normally assigns boundary data on two three-surfaces (it should be stressed, however, that unlike scattering problems we are considering a path-integral representation of amplitudes in a finite region). On denoting by a and b , with $a > b$, the radii of the two concentric three-sphere boundaries, we can consider the complete form (4.20) of our scalar modes, because no singularity at the origin occurs in the two-boundary problem, and hence all linearly independent integrals are regular, for all $\tau \in [b, a]$. We now impose the boundary conditions (4.5) and (4.6), which lead to the eigenvalue condition

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} I_n(Mb) & K_n(Mb) & J_n(Mb) & N_n(Mb) \\ F_{I_n}(Mb) & F_{K_n}(Mb) & F_{J_n}(Mb) & F_{N_n}(Mb) \\ I_n(Ma) & K_n(Ma) & J_n(Ma) & N_n(Ma) \\ F_{I_n}(Ma) & F_{K_n}(Ma) & F_{J_n}(Ma) & F_{N_n}(Ma) \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (4.26)$$

where, for $Z = I, K, J$ or N , we define [29]

$$F_{Z_n}(Mx) \equiv -Z_n(Mx) + MxZ'_n(Mx). \quad (4.27)$$

The work in Ref. [29] proves that Eq. (4.26) leads to a vanishing $\zeta(0)$ value:

$$\zeta(0) = 0. \quad (4.28)$$

The result (4.28) is found to hold for all boundary conditions described in Eqs. (4.10)–(4.17).

To sum up, the original contribution of Ref. [29] is as follows.

(i) The boundary conditions for which the squared Laplace operator is self-adjoint have been derived for the first time, taking as prototype the operator $\frac{d^4}{dx^4}$ on a closed interval of the real line. Interestingly, four sets of boundary conditions are then found to arise, and the option described by (4.10) and (4.11) coincides, if the field in (4.7) were a ghost field, with the boundary conditions obtained from the request of gauge invariance of the boundary conditions on A_b , when the Eastwood–Singer supplementary condition is imposed.

(ii) Given the fourth-order eigenvalue equation (4.19), the contribution of the corresponding eigenmodes to the one-loop divergence has been derived for the first time on the

Euclidean four-ball (see (4.25)), or on the portion of flat Euclidean four-space bounded by two concentric three-spheres (see (4.28)).

In our opinion, the result (i) is crucial because no complete prescription for the quantization is obtained unless suitable sets of boundary conditions are imposed, and Eqs. (4.10)–(4.17) represent a non-trivial step in this direction. The result (ii) is instead relevant for the analysis of one-loop semiclassical effects in quantum field theory. In other words, if one has to come to terms with higher order differential operators in the quantization of gauge theories and gravitation, it appears necessary to develop techniques for a systematic investigation of one-loop ultraviolet divergences, as a first step towards a thorough understanding of their perturbative properties.

Some outstanding problems are now in sight. First, it appears interesting to extend our mode-by-mode analysis to curved backgrounds with boundary. In this case, the fourth-order conformally covariant differential operator is more complicated than the squared Laplace operator, and involves also the Ricci curvature and the scalar curvature of the background. Second, one should use Weyl’s theorem on the invariants of the orthogonal group to understand the general structure of heat-kernel asymptotics for fourth-order differential operators on manifolds with boundary. A naturally occurring question within that framework is, to what extent functorial methods can then be used to compute all heat-kernel coefficients for a given form of the differential operator and of the boundary operator (cf. Refs. [20,21]). Third, the recently considered effect of tangential derivatives in the boundary operator [15–18,20–22] might give rise to generalized boundary conditions for conformally covariant operators. The appropriate mathematical theory is still lacking in the literature, but would be of much help for the current attempts to understand the formulation of quantum field theories on manifolds with boundary.

5. Non-local boundary conditions in Euclidean quantum gravity

The last decade of efforts on the problem of boundary conditions in (one-loop) Euclidean quantum gravity has focused on a *local formulation*, by trying to satisfy the following requirements:

- (i) Local nature of the boundary operators [6–9,11,12,16,17,20,22].
- (ii) Operator on metric perturbations, say P , and ghost operator, say Q , of Laplace type [17].
- (iii) Symmetry, and, possibly, (essential) self-adjointness of the differential operators P and Q [11,12].
- (iv) Strong ellipticity of the boundary-value problems obtained from the operators P and Q , with local boundary operators B_1 and B_2 , respectively [17,22].
- (v) Gauge- and BRST-invariance of the boundary conditions and/or of the out-in (one-loop) amplitude [6,7,9,11,12,14,16,17,22].

At about the same time, in the applications to quantum field theory and quantum gravity, non-local boundary conditions had been studied mainly for operators of Dirac type (see, however, Ref. [10]), relying on the early work by Atiyah, Patodi and Singer on spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry [34]. What is non-local, within that framework, is the separation of the spectrum of a first-order elliptic operator (the Dirac operator on the boundary) into its positive and negative parts. This leads, in turn, to an unambiguous identification of positive- and negative-frequency modes of the (massive or massless) Dirac field, and half of them are set to zero on the bounding surface [3,8,35].

On the other hand, non-local boundary conditions for operators of Laplace type had already been studied quite intensively in the literature, from at least two points of view:

- (i) The rich mathematical theory of pseudo-differential boundary-value problems, where both the differential operator P and the boundary operator B may be replaced by integro-differential operators [4].
- (ii) Bose–Einstein condensation models, where integro-differential boundary operators lead to the existence of bulk and surface states [36].

For example, if P is an operator of Laplace type, mathematicians have derived many properties of the boundary-value problem [4]

$$Pu = f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (5.1)$$

$$Tu = \varphi \quad \text{at } \Gamma \equiv \partial\Omega, \quad (5.2)$$

where the boundary operator T can take the form

$$Tu = \gamma_0 u + T'_0 u, \quad (5.3)$$

or, instead,

$$Tu = \gamma_1 u + S_0 \gamma_0 u + T'_1 u. \quad (5.4)$$

With this notation, one has [4]

$$\gamma_j u \equiv \left[(-i\partial_n)^j u \right]_{\partial\Omega}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots \quad (5.5)$$

where ∂_n is the inward-pointing normal derivative. Moreover, T'_0 and T'_1 are integral operators going from Ω to $\partial\Omega$, and the map S_0 acts on functions on $\partial\Omega$.

In the case of the gravitational field, inspired by Eqs. (5.1)–(5.5), we consider a scheme where the differential operator on metric perturbations remains of Laplace type (as well as the ghost operator), whereas the boundary conditions are of integro-differential nature. This means that the full boundary operator, say $B_{ab}{}^{cd}$, may be expressed as the sum of a local operator, say $\tilde{B}_{ab}{}^{cd}$, obtained from projectors and first-order differential operators (see (1.5) and (1.6)), and an integral operator going from the background four-manifold, M , to its boundary ∂M , so that the boundary conditions read

$$\left[B_{ab}{}^{cd} h_{cd}(x) \right]_{\partial M} = \left[\tilde{B}_{ab}{}^{cd} h_{cd}(x) \right]_{\partial M} + \left[\int_{\partial M} T_{ab}{}^{cd}(x, x') h_{cd}(x') d\Sigma' \right]_{\partial M}. \quad (5.6a)$$

This notation is a bit too general. We may decide, following DeWitt [37], that unprimed lower-case indices refer to the point x and primed lower-case indices refer to the point x' . This leads to

$$\left[B_{ab}{}^{cd} h_{cd}(x) \right]_{\partial M} = \left[\tilde{B}_{ab}{}^{cd} h_{cd}(x) \right]_{\partial M} + \left[\int_{\partial M} T_{ab}{}^{c'd'} h_{c'd'} d\Sigma' \right]_{\partial M}, \quad (5.6b)$$

which is the form of the boundary conditions chosen hereafter [13].

Since we are concerned, for simplicity, with operators of Laplace type in a flat four-dimensional background (all curvature effects result then from the boundary only), it is very important for us to understand the effect of integro-differential boundary conditions on such a class of operators. For this purpose, following Ref. [4], we remark that, after integration by parts, one finds the Green formula (unlike Ref. [4], we define the Laplace operator with a negative sign in front of all second derivatives), for $P = \Delta$, $u \in D(P)$, and v in the domain $D(P^*)$ of the adjoint of P :

$$(Pu, v)_\Omega = \left(\Delta u, v \right)_\Omega = \left(u, \Delta v \right)_\Omega + \left(\mathcal{U}\rho u, \rho v \right)_\Gamma, \quad (5.7)$$

where the *Green matrix* reads, in our case [4]

$$\mathcal{U} = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.8)$$

whilst ρ is the (Cauchy) boundary operator, whose action reduces to

$$\rho u = (\gamma_0 u, \gamma_1 u). \quad (5.9)$$

The same property (5.9) holds for $v \in D(P^*)$. Suppose now that the boundary conditions are expressed in the integro-differential form (5.3):

$$\gamma_0 u + T'_0 u = 0 \quad \text{at } \Gamma.$$

The term $\left(\mathcal{U}\rho u, \rho v \right)_\Gamma$ in Eq. (5.7), which is equal to

$$\left(\mathcal{U}\rho u, \rho v \right)_\Gamma = i(\gamma_1 u, \gamma_0 v)_\Gamma + i(\gamma_0 u, \gamma_1 v)_\Gamma, \quad (5.10a)$$

can be then re-expressed as

$$\left(\mathcal{U}\rho u, \rho v \right)_\Gamma = i(\gamma_1 u, \gamma_0 v)_\Gamma + i(-T'_0 u, \gamma_1 v)_\Gamma, \quad (5.10b)$$

which implies that P^* , the (formal) adjoint of P , can be obtained by adding to Δ a singular Green operator, i.e.

$$P^*v = \Delta v + iT_0'^* \gamma_1 v, \quad (5.11)$$

supplemented by the local boundary condition

$$\gamma_0 v = 0 \text{ at } \Gamma. \quad (5.12)$$

By contrast, if the boundary conditions (5.4) are imposed:

$$\gamma_1 u + S_0 \gamma_0 u + T_1' u = 0 \text{ at } \Gamma,$$

which modify the standard Neumann case, it is convenient to re-express $\gamma_1 u$, at the boundary, in the form

$$\gamma_1 u = -S_0 \gamma_0 u - T_1' u, \quad (5.13)$$

and insert Eq. (5.13) into Eq. (5.10a). This implies that the adjoint of P now reads

$$P^*v = \Delta v + iT_1'^* \gamma_0 v, \quad (5.14)$$

subject to the local boundary condition

$$\gamma_1 v = 0 \text{ at } \Gamma. \quad (5.15)$$

In other words, we are discovering a property which is known to some mathematicians, but not so familiar to physicists: if an elliptic differential operator (here taken to be of Laplace type) is studied with integro-differential boundary conditions, its adjoint is a pseudo-differential operator, subject to local boundary conditions.

Self-adjointness problems are properly formulated by studying the so-called *realization* of the operator P [4]. In our case, this means adding to the Laplacian a singular Green operator, and considering a *trace operator* which expresses the integro-differential boundary conditions. More precisely, a Dirichlet-type realization of $P = \Delta$ is the operator

$$B_D \equiv \left(\Delta + G_D \right)_{T_0}, \quad (5.16)$$

where

$$G_D \equiv K_1 \gamma_1 + G', \quad (5.17)$$

$$T_0 \equiv \gamma_0 + T'_0. \quad (5.18)$$

The K_i operators, for $i = 0, 1$, are completely determined by the requirement of self-adjointness. In technical language, they are called Poisson operators [4]. Indeed, the domains of B_D and its adjoint coincide if and only if [4]

$$K_1 = i T_0'^*, \quad (5.19)$$

$$G' = G'^*. \quad (5.20)$$

Moreover, a Neumann-type realization of $P = \Delta$ is the operator

$$B_N \equiv \left(\Delta + G_N \right)_{T_1}, \quad (5.21)$$

where

$$G_N \equiv K_0 \gamma_0 + F', \quad (5.22)$$

$$T_1 \equiv \gamma_1 + S_0 \gamma_0 + T'_1. \quad (5.23)$$

The domains of B_N and its adjoint are then found to coincide if and only if [4]

$$K_0 = i T_1'^*, \quad (5.24)$$

$$S_0 = -S_0^*, \quad (5.25)$$

$$F' = F'^*. \quad (5.26)$$

In the case of the gravitational field, our boundary operator (5.6b) corresponds to the integro-differential trace operator (5.18). The local boundary operator $\tilde{B}_{ab}^{cd}$ is taken to be the one for which the following conditions are imposed on metric perturbations on a three-sphere boundary of radius a [7]:

$$\left[h_{ij} \right]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (5.27)$$

$$\left[h_{0i} \right]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (5.28)$$

$$\left[\frac{\partial h_{00}}{\partial \tau} + \frac{6}{\tau} h_{00} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} (g^{ij} h_{ij}) \right]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (5.29)$$

where $\tau \in [0, a]$. Equations (5.27)–(5.29) express, to our knowledge, the only set of local boundary conditions which are of Dirichlet type on h_{ij} and h_{0i} , and for which strong ellipticity of the boundary-value problem is not violated (cf. section 3). Since we only want to modify the Dirichlet sector of such boundary conditions [13], which is expressed by (5.27) and (5.28), we have to require that (see (5.6b))

$$T_{00}{}^{c'd'} = 0 \quad \forall c', d'. \quad (5.30)$$

Thus, we eventually consider the operator

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \Delta + G \\ S \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.31)$$

where S is of the type (5.18) in its ij and $0i$ components, i.e.

$$\left[S_{ij}{}^{cd} h_{cd}(x) \right]_{\partial M} = \left[h_{ij}(x) \right]_{\partial M} + \left[\int_{\partial M} T_{ij}{}^{c'd'} h_{c'd'} d\Sigma' \right]_{\partial M}, \quad (5.32)$$

$$\left[S_{0i}{}^{cd} h_{cd}(x) \right]_{\partial M} = \left[h_{0i} \right]_{\partial M} + \left[\int_{\partial M} T_{0i}{}^{c'd'} h_{c'd'} d\Sigma' \right]_{\partial M}, \quad (5.33)$$

and of the type (5.29) (cf. Eq. (5.23)) in its normal component h_{00} , i.e.

$$\left[S_{00}{}^{cd} h_{cd}(x) \right]_{\partial M} = \left[\frac{\partial h_{00}}{\partial \tau} + \frac{6}{\tau} h_{00} - \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} (g^{ij} h_{ij}) \right]_{\partial M}. \quad (5.34)$$

Moreover, Δ is the standard Laplacian on metric perturbations in flat Euclidean four-space, and G may be viewed as the direct sum of G_D and G_N (cf. example 1.6.16 in Ref. [4]), with

$$G_D = K_1 \gamma_1 + G', \quad (5.35)$$

$$G_N = F', \quad (5.36)$$

subject to the self-adjointness conditions

$$\left[(K_1)_{ij}{}^{cd} h_{cd} \right]_{\partial M} = i \left[\int_{\partial M} T_{ij}{}^{c'd'} h_{c'd'} d\Sigma' \right]_{\partial M}^*, \quad (5.37)$$

$$\left[(K_1)_{0i}{}^{cd} h_{cd} \right]_{\partial M} = i \left[\int_{\partial M} T_{0i}{}^{c'd'} h_{c'd'} d\Sigma' \right]_{\partial M}^*, \quad (5.38)$$

$$\left[(K_1)_{00}{}^{cd} h_{cd} \right]_{\partial M} = 0, \quad (5.39)$$

$$G'_{ab}{}^{cd} = \left(G'_{ab}{}^{cd} \right)^*, \quad (5.40)$$

$$F'_{ab}{}^{cd} = \left(F'_{ab}{}^{cd} \right)^*. \quad (5.41)$$

Note that, by virtue of Eq. (5.30), the counterpart of T'_1 vanishes in our problem, and hence no counterpart of Eq. (5.24) has to be imposed. Further to this, the condition (5.25) is satisfied by virtue of the boundary condition (5.34).

The contribution of Ref. [13], summarized in the present section, consists of the proposal that the boundary conditions (5.6*b*) should be considered as a serious candidate for non-local boundary conditions in Euclidean quantum gravity; moreover, the self-adjointness conditions (5.37)–(5.41) have been derived, inspired by a careful analysis of the results first derived in Ref. [4]. At least four outstanding problems are now in sight:

- (i) Can one build explicitly a class of bulk and surface states in Euclidean quantum gravity with non-local boundary conditions, inspired by the work in Ref. [36]? The idea is then to obtain mode-by-mode solutions of the eigenvalue equations for metric perturbations, and insert them into Eq. (5.6*b*) for a given form of $T_{ab}{}^{c'd'}$. One then looks for solutions which decay rapidly away from the boundary (the surface states), or remain non-negligible (the bulk states).
- (ii) Can one study heat-kernel asymptotics with non-local boundary conditions for the gravitational field?

(iii) Can one perform a path-integral quantization, if the non-local choice (5.6b) is made for the boundary data? What form of boundary conditions should be imposed on ghost fields?

(iv) Can one obtain a non-local formulation of Euclidean quantum gravity, where both the differential operators and the boundary operators are replaced by suitable classes of pseudo-differential operators, taking full advantage of the recent progress in the field of functional calculus for pseudo-differential boundary-value problems [4]?

6. Concluding remarks

Our presentation, although incomplete for obvious length limits, has tried to open the window on what we regard as several promising research lines for the years to come. They can be summarized by a number of questions, as follows.

(i) When tangential derivatives occur in the boundary operator, can one compute further heat-kernel coefficients for operators of Laplace type in the Abelian (see (2.4) and (2.5)) and non-Abelian cases?

(ii) What about the general structure of heat-kernel asymptotics for non-minimal operators [2,38,39] and conformally covariant operators [23,24] on manifolds with boundary?

(iii) Can one obtain a non-local formulation of Euclidean quantum gravity with the help of functional calculus for pseudo-differential boundary-value problems, along the lines of Refs. [4] and [13]? Is there a corresponding heat-kernel asymptotics? Can one build explicitly bulk and surface states in Euclidean quantum gravity?

(iv) What lesson should one learn from the recent proof that there is lack of strong ellipticity in Euclidean quantum gravity, upon choosing completely gauge-invariant boundary conditions with gauge-field and ghost operators of Laplace type [17,22]? Can one then define a smeared functional trace (cf. (1.7)) which is not *ad hoc*? Is it correct to conclude that BRST-invariant boundary conditions for the quantized gravitational field turn out to be incompatible with the need for a well defined elliptic theory?

The first two problems that we have selected might seem very technical, but their solution would lead to a substantial advancement of knowledge in spectral geometry and in the general theory of operators on manifolds. The remaining problems lie, instead, at the very heart of any attempt to get a deeper understanding of Euclidean quantum gravity. The whole programme might seem as either too ambitious or too abstract to the pragmatic reader, but such a stand would be most unfortunate. In our opinion, there are, by contrast, several good reasons for continuing advanced research along these lines, i.e.

(i) Quantum gravity via Euclidean path integrals makes it possible to deal with a framework where, quite naturally, partition functions are defined. This is, in turn, crucial if one wants to combine quantum theory, whose predictions are of statistical nature [3], with general relativity.

(ii) Non-local properties are frequently met in the course of studying modern quantum field theories via path-integral or canonical methods (cf. Ref. [40]). Thus, a non-local approach to Euclidean quantum gravity appears essential to complete the current efforts.

(iii) Spectral geometry plays a crucial role if one tries to get a thorough understanding of the one-loop semiclassical approximation [3,8,12]. In a space-time approach [41–44], such an approximation provides the “bridge” in between the classical world and the (as yet unknown) full quantum theory (via path integrals). At some stage, any alternative approach to quantum gravity should be able to make contact with what one knows from a perturbative evaluation of transition amplitudes [12].

(iv) So much has been learned from the heat-kernel approach to index theory and to the theory of eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry [2–4,12] that any new result may have a non-trivial impact on Euclidean quantum gravity. Some readers might feel unhappy with the idea of having to formulate the quantum theory in a Euclidean framework, where no time-evolution exists, the differential operators are elliptic and the geometries are Riemannian (rather than Lorentzian as in general relativity). However, if one is interested in the most fundamental structures, it is not bad news to realize that a framework exists where some problems become well posed. From this point of view, one has to go ahead as

long as possible with Euclidean problems, before being sure that quantum theory needs a Lorentzian framework. In other words, if a manifold picture retains an important role in quantum field theory, the problem is open of whether one should regard the elliptic boundary-value problems as the most fundamental tool. In the years to come, hopefully, further progress in the topics discussed so far might lead to a deeper vision.

Appendix

The consideration of special cases remains of considerable help in the investigation of heat-kernel asymptotics, because the local invariants in the integrand for heat-kernel coefficients are multiplied by universal functions, whose form remains the same for all smooth boundaries (see section 1). Thus, if one is able to evaluate a subset of the general set of universal functions, one can use this result, jointly with the algebraic equations resulting from (2.1)–(2.3) and from the application of lemmas on product manifolds [1,2], until one eventually gets enough algebraic equations to evaluate all universal functions corresponding to a given heat-kernel coefficient [21].

Thus, following Ref. [20], we consider the case when all curvatures vanish: $R^a_{bcd} = 0$, $\Omega_{ab} = 0$, $K_{ij} = 0$, whilst E , S and Γ^i are covariantly constant, in that

$$\nabla E = 0, \quad \widehat{\nabla} S = 0, \quad \widehat{\nabla}_i \Gamma^j = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The coefficient $A_{5/2}$ is a purely boundary term, and from Ref. [20] one finds in our case

$$A_{5/2} = \int_{\partial M} \text{Tr}_V \left[\sum_{k=0}^2 \sum_{j=0}^{4-2k} \frac{1}{k!} \rho_{j,4-2k}(\Gamma) E^k S^j f^{(4-2k-j)} \right], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $f^{(r)}$ is the normal derivative of f of order r (e.g., $f^{(2)} = f_{;NN}$), and $\rho_{n,k}$ are universal functions generated by the following algorithm:

$$\alpha_{n,k} = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma \left(\frac{n+k}{2} + 1 \right) \int_0^\infty du \frac{u^k}{[u^2 + u + \frac{1}{4}(1 + \Gamma^2)]^{\frac{n+k}{2}+1}}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\rho_{0,k} = \frac{1}{k!} \left[\frac{1}{2} \Gamma \left(\frac{k+1}{2} \right) - \Gamma^2 \alpha_{1,k} \right], \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\rho_{n,k} = \frac{1}{n!(k-n)!} \left[2n\alpha_{n-1,k-n} - \Gamma^2 \alpha_{n+1,k-n} \right]. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

All universal functions are well defined and analytic provided that $1 + \Gamma^2 > 0$. As remarked in Refs. [18,20] this reflects a crucial property: when $\Gamma^2 = -1$, the strong ellipticity of the boundary-value problem no longer holds. In our paper, we always assume that $1 + \Gamma^2$ is positive.

Now the explicit form of $A_{5/2}$ is, from Eq. (A.2),

$$\begin{aligned} A_{5/2} = & \int_{\partial M} \text{Tr}_V \left[f(\rho_{4,4} S^4 + \rho_{2,2} E S^2 + \frac{1}{2} \rho_{0,0} E^2) \right. \\ & + f_{;N}(\rho_{3,4} S^3 + \rho_{1,2} E S) + f_{;NN}(\rho_{2,4} S^2 + \rho_{0,2} E) \\ & \left. + f_{;NNN} \rho_{1,4} S + f_{;NNNN} \rho_{0,4} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

A careful application of the algorithm (A.3)–(A.5) yields therefore

$$\rho_{0,0} = \sqrt{\pi} \left[-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2}} \right], \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\rho_{2,2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{(1 + \Gamma^2)^{3/2}}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\rho_{4,4} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{(1 + \Gamma^2)^{5/2}}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\rho_{1,2} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\Gamma^2} \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2}} \right], \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$\rho_{3,4} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{3\Gamma^4} \left[2 - \frac{(2 + 3\Gamma^2)}{(1 + \Gamma^2)^{3/2}} \right], \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$\rho_{0,2} = \sqrt{\pi} \left[-\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{2\Gamma^2} \left(\sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2} - 1 \right) \right], \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$\rho_{2,4} = \sqrt{\pi} \left[\frac{1}{\Gamma^4} \left(\sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2} - 1 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\Gamma^2 \sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2}} \right], \quad (\text{A.13})$$

$$\rho_{1,4} = \sqrt{\pi} \left[\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\Gamma^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\Gamma^4} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2} \right) \right], \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$\rho_{0,4} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{64} \left[-1 - \frac{8}{\Gamma^2} + \frac{16}{3} \frac{1}{\Gamma^4} \left((1 + \Gamma^2)^{3/2} - 1 \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Note that all these new universal functions have a smooth limit at $\Gamma = 0$, where they coincide with the Robin coefficients: $\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}, \sqrt{\pi}, \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{4}, \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{8}, \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{8}, -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{8}, \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{64}$, respectively.

These new universal functions can be computed by hand after noticing that, by virtue of (A.3)–(A.5), one deals repeatedly with the integral

$$R(a, b, \Gamma) \equiv \int_0^\infty du \frac{u^a}{[u^2 + u + \frac{1}{4}(1 + \Gamma^2)]^b}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

For example, one finds

$$R(4, 7/2, \Gamma) = R(2, 5/2, \Gamma) - R(3, 7/2, \Gamma) - \frac{1}{4}(1 + \Gamma^2)R(2, 7/2, \Gamma), \quad (\text{A.17})$$

and this leads to the result (A.15), because

$$R(2, 5/2, \Gamma) = -\frac{8}{3} \frac{\sqrt{1 + \Gamma^2}}{\Gamma^4} + \frac{8}{3} \frac{1}{\Gamma^4} + \frac{4}{3} \frac{1}{\Gamma^2}, \quad (\text{A.18})$$

$$R(2, 7/2, \Gamma) = -\frac{4}{5\Gamma} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Gamma} R(2, 5/2, \Gamma), \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$R(3, 7/2, \Gamma) = R(1, 5/2, \Gamma) - R(2, 7/2, \Gamma) - \frac{1}{4}(1 + \Gamma^2)R(1, 7/2, \Gamma). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Acknowledgments

The author is much indebted to Ivan Avramidi and Alexander Kamenshchik for scientific collaboration on heat-kernel methods in quantum field theory. Correspondence with Andrei Barvinsky, Stuart Dowker, Klaus Kirsten, Hugh Osborn and Dmitri Vassilevich was also very helpful.

References

- [1] Branson T. P. and Gilkey P. B. (1990) *Commun. Part. Diff. Eqs.* **15**, 245.

- [2] Gilkey P. B. (1995) *Invariance Theory, the Heat Equation and the Atiyah-Singer Index Theorem* (Boca Raton: Chemical Rubber Company).
- [3] Esposito G. (1998) *Dirac Operators and Spectral Geometry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- [4] Grubb G. (1996) *Functional Calculus of Pseudo Differential Boundary Problems* (Boston: Birkhäuser).
- [5] Günther P. and Schimming R. (1977) *J. Diff. Geom.* **12**, 599.
- [6] Barvinsky A. O. (1987) *Phys. Lett. B* **195**, 344.
- [7] Moss I. G. and Poletti S. (1990) *Nucl. Phys. B* **341**, 155.
- [8] Esposito G. (1994) *Quantum Gravity, Quantum Cosmology and Lorentzian Geometries* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag).
- [9] Esposito G. and Kamenshchik A. Yu. (1995) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **12**, 2715.
- [10] Marachevsky V. N. and Vassilevich D. V. (1996) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 645.
- [11] Avramidi I. G., Esposito G. and Kamenshchik A. Yu. (1996) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 2361.
- [12] Esposito G., Kamenshchik A. Yu. and Pollifrone G. (1997) *Euclidean Quantum Gravity on Manifolds with Boundary* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).
- [13] Esposito G. (1998) Non-Local Boundary Conditions in Euclidean Quantum Gravity (gr-qc 9806057).
- [14] Luckock H. C. (1991) *J. Math. Phys.* **32**, 1755.
- [15] McAvity D. M. and Osborn H. (1991) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **8**, 1445.
- [16] Moss I. G. and Silva P. J. (1997) *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 1072.
- [17] Avramidi I. G. and Esposito G. (1997) Gauge Theories on Manifolds with Boundary (hep-th 9710048).
- [18] Dowker J. S. and Kirsten K. (1997) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **14**, L169.
- [19] Kirsten K. (1998) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **15**, L5.
- [20] Avramidi I. G. and Esposito G. (1998) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **15**, 281.
- [21] Dowker J. S. and Kirsten K. (1998) The $a_{3/2}$ Heat-Kernel Coefficient for Oblique Boundary Conditions (hep-th 9806168).
- [22] Avramidi I. G. and Esposito G. (1998) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **15**, 1141.

- [23] Branson T. P. (1996) *Commun. Math. Phys.* **178**, 301.
- [24] Erdmenger J. (1997) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **14**, 2061.
- [25] Erdmenger J. and Osborn H. (1998) *Class. Quantum Grav.* **15**, 273.
- [26] Avramidi I. G. (1997) *Phys. Lett.* **B 403**, 280.
- [27] Avramidi I. G. (1998) *J. Math. Phys.* **39**, 2889.
- [28] Esposito G. (1997) *Phys. Rev.* **D 56**, 2442.
- [29] Esposito G. and Kamenshchik A. Yu. (1998) Fourth-Order Operators on Manifolds with Boundary (hep-th 9803036).
- [30] Eastwood M. and Singer I. M. (1985) *Phys. Lett.* **A 107**, 73.
- [31] Schleich K. (1985) *Phys. Rev.* **D 32**, 1889.
- [32] Lifshitz E. M. and Khalatnikov I. M. (1963) *Adv. Phys.* **12**, 185.
- [33] DeWitt B. S. (1965) *Dynamical Theory of Groups and Fields* (New York: Gordon and Breach).
- [34] Atiyah M. F., Patodi V. K. and Singer I. M. (1975) *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **77**, 43.
- [35] D'Eath P. D. and Halliwell J. J. (1987) *Phys. Rev.* **D 35**, 1100.
- [36] Schröder M. (1989) *Rep. Math. Phys.* **27**, 259.
- [37] DeWitt B. S. (1967) *Phys. Rev.* **160**, 1113.
- [38] Avramidi I. G. and Branson T. P. (1998) Leading Symbols and Representation Theory (work in preparation).
- [39] Avramidi I. G. and Branson T. P. (1998) Heat-Kernel Asymptotics of Non-Diagonal Operators (work in preparation).
- [40] Avramidi I. G. (1991) *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A 6**, 1693.
- [41] Misner C. W. (1957) *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **29**, 497.
- [42] Hawking S. W. (1979) in *General Relativity, an Einstein Centenary Survey*, eds. S. W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 746.
- [43] DeWitt B. S. (1984) in *Relativity, Groups and Topology II*, eds. B. S. DeWitt and R. Stora (Amsterdam: North Holland) 381.
- [44] Gibbons G. W. and Hawking S. W. (1993) *Euclidean Quantum Gravity* (Singapore: World Scientific).